



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/631,265	08/02/2000	David C. Taylor	1785.2.2	8423
28049	7590	04/07/2004		
PATE PIERCE & BAIRD 215 SOUTH STATE STREET, SUITE 550 PARKSIDE TOWER SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111				
EXAMINER CHANNAVAJALA, SRIRAMA T				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2177		13		

DATE MAILED: 04/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/631,265

Applicant(s)

TAYLOR, DAVID C.

Examiner

Srirama Channavajjala

Art Unit

2177

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 March 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2177

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Examiner acknowledges applicants' Request for reconsideration filed on 3/8/2003, paper no.12.
2. Claims 1-24 are pending in this application.
3. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 8/15/2003 has been entered paper no. # 8, and a non-final Office action mailed on 9/5/2003, paper no. # 11.
4. Examiner acknowledges applicant's amendment filed on 8/15/2003, paper no.9
5. Claims 23-24 have been added, paper no. # 9.
6. Examiner acknowledges applicant's amendment filed on 2/10/2003, paper no.5.
7. Claims 1,3-7,9,12-22 have been amended, paper no. # 5.

Drawings

8. The drawings filed on 8/2/2000 are approved by the Draftsperson under 37 CFR 1.84 or 1.152.

Art Unit: 2177

Priority

9. Applicant's claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) is acknowledged. based on the provisional application SI.No. 60/146,878 filed on 8/3/1999.

Information Disclosure Statement

13. The information disclosure statement filed on 8/15/2003, paper no. # 10 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.97(d) because it lacks a statement, specific publishing date as specified in 37 CFR 1.97(e). It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered. It appears that Applicant simply printed [8/12/2003] information from INTERNET source.

Applicant is hereby required to provide specific document such as A1-A2 with specific publishing date on PTO-1449 in response to this office action, paper no. # 13.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

14. Claims 1-10, 12-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Maynard, US Patent No. 6175830.

15. As to Claims 1,14,17, Maynard teaches a system which including 'extracting information desired by a user from a source' [see Abstract], extracting information desired by a user from a source corresponds to retrieving and displaying information such as document, a number of individual documents, more specifically web pages resident on the Internet which are interest to the users from the search results as detailed in the Abstract, 'an input module to acquire text from a user' [col 13, line 53-58], Maynard teaches search engine, more specifically user entering the search query element 82, further it is noted that Maynard teaches various modules for example index module, search module, break module [see fig 1,4] may include search word or phrases through user interface, examiner interpreting user interface corresponds to input module for acquiring text from a user, 'a filtering module programmed to determine a micro-context relevant to the text' [col 13, line 13-17, line 25-29, col 14, line 4-15, line 44-53], Maynard specifically teaches search engine capable of not only searches wide varieties

Art Unit: 2177

of information or databases, but also matching information based on the input including optional filter that will filter out web sites that corresponds to filtering module, more specifically Maynard directed to search module utilizing search query to search through the database records element 80a-80z to find the database records element 86 matching the words or phrases in the search query as detailed in col 14, line 4-7, it is also noted that Maynard teaches specifically break module that break up the information into finite elements for example paragraphs, sections, sub-sections, segments and like [col 1, line 57-64] corresponds to matching the micro-context relevant to the text, 'filtering module further programmed to locate information corresponding to the micro-context in a database'[col 2, line 21-24, line 60-66, col 14, line 44-53], locate the information by matching the micro-context in a database corresponds to match between search word or phrase and the non-common word or phrase contained within the database records as detailed in col 14, line 44-53, further Mayanard also teaches for example web information or link may consider a finite element(s) for matching the specific search requested, therefore, micro-context is integral part of Mayanard's information retrieval system; 'a context construction module to combine words in the text to form the micro-context characteristic of the information' [col 4, line 6-13, col 4, line 17-26], Mayanard specifically teaches dividing the informational resources into finite elements, these finite elements corresponds to micro-context information 'a context comparison module to determine a macro-context relevant to the information by comparing the micro-context to the corpus'[col3, line 64-67, col 4, line 1-5], examiner interpreting macro-context relevant corresponds to web pages because web

Art Unit: 2177

pages containing tags, links, words, phrases and like, more specifically finite elements or micro-context to the corpus corresponds to embedded categorical tags in the database as detailed in col 3, line 64-67, col 4, line 1-5, 'an information matching module to locate information corresponding to the macro-context in the database' [col 3, line 64-67, col 4, line 1-5, line 33-51], Maynard specifically teaches each database record preferably includes an address or pointer to the corresponding finite element that corresponds to determine the location of the information in the database, 'the database being contextually indexed for searching by context' [col 6, line 30-39], Maynard teaches specifically index module that is used in searchable databases as detailed in fig 1, col 6, line 30-33, 'a presentation module to receive the information and present the information to a user' [fig 1, col 5, line 40-52, col 12, line 34-38], Maynard teaches displaying the search results that corresponds to presenting the information to a user.

16. As to Claim 2, Maynard teaches a system which including 'micro-context is independent of a hierarchical ordering of the database' [col 6, line 6-13].

17. As to Claim 3, Maynard teaches a system which including 'filtering module comprises a context construction module to combine words in the text to form the micro-context further being characteristic of the information' [col3, line 64-67, col 4, line 1-5, col 13, line 13-17, line 25-29, col 14, line 4-15, line 44-53], Maynard specifically teaches search engine to include optional filter that will filter out web sites that corresponds to

filtering module, examiner interpreting macro-context relevant corresponds to web pages, micro-context to the corpus corresponds to embedded categorical tags that including finite elements related to strings or words or phrases and like in the database as detailed in col 3, line 64-67, col 4, line 1-5.

18. As to Claim 4, Maynard teaches a system which including 'filtering module further comprises a context comparison module to acquire a macro-context relevant to the micro-context' [col3, line 64-67, col 4, line 1-5, col 4, line 33-46, col 9, line 56-60, col 13, line 13-17, line 25-29, col 14, line 4-15, line 44-53], Maynard specifically teaches search engine to include optional filter that will filter out web sites that corresponds to filtering module, further Maynard teaches identifying finite elements that including identifying sections or sub-sections within the documents or data stream that is relevant to the database [see col 4, line 33-36], also Maynard suggests crate an automatic tool for matching patterns that distinguish segments or elements within any type of information resources [see col 9, line 56-60].

19. As to Claim 5, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the above rejection of claim 4 above, in addition, Maynard disclosed 'matching module to locate information corresponding to the macro-context in the database, the database being contextually indexed for searching by context' [col 3, line 64-67, col 4, line 1-5, line 33-51, col 6, line 30-39], Maynard specifically teaches each database record preferably includes an address or pointer to the corresponding finite element that corresponds to determine the

Art Unit: 2177

location of the information in the database, Maynard teaches specifically index module that is used in searchable databases as detailed in fig 1, col 6, line 30-33.

20. As to Claims 6, 15, 20, Maynard teaches a system which including 'presentation module is programmed to selectively present the information in a format designated by a user' [fig 1, col 5, line 40-52, col 12, line 34-38], Maynard teaches displaying the search results that corresponds to presenting the information to a user.

21. As to Claims 7 and 16, Maynard teaches a system which including 'mining module to add new data to the database by selectively retrieving the new data from the source' [col 6, line 13-18].

22. As to Claim 8-10, Maynard teaches a system which including 'mining module retrieves data from the source over a network' [col 14, line 17-19], network corresponds to Internet.

23. As to Claims 12 and 22, Maynard teaches a system which including 'updating module to update the information periodically after presentation to a user' [col 13, line 25-29, line 49-52].

24. As to Claim 13, Maynard teaches a system which including 'database further comprises a subset to store information for future access by a user' [col 13, line 40-49].

Art Unit: 2177

25. As to Claim 18, Maynard teaches a system which including 'combining relevant words in the text to form the micro-context characteristic of the information' [col 14, line 4-28].

26. As to Claim 19, Maynard teaches a system which including 'locating further comprises searching through indices in the database, wherein the indices have a format similar to the macro-contexts, and returning information linked to indices which correlate to the macro-contexts' [col 3, line 64-67, col 4, line 1-5, line 33-51, col 6, line 30-39], Maynard specifically teaches each database record preferably includes an address or pointer to the corresponding finite element that corresponds to determine the location of the information in the database, Maynard teaches specifically index module that is used in searchable databases as detailed in fig 1, col 6, line 30-33.

27. As to Claim 21, Maynard teaches a system which including 'selectively retrieving data from the source over a network to add to the database' [[col 6, line 13-18, col 14, line 17-19], network corresponds to Internet.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

28. Claims 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gable, US Patent No. 6029165.

29. As to Claims 23-24, Gable teaches a system which including 'extracting information desired by a user from a source' [see Abstract], Gable specifically directed to search and retrieval of information from database, more specifically library of topics as detailed in fig 3, 'an input module to receive textual input from a user' [fig 5, element 15, col 6, line 33-38], 'Gable specifically teaches user interface in which user inputting

Art Unit: 2177

required information for searching and retrieving, 'a filtering module to receive the textual input from the input module and to filter the textual input to determine a micro-content relevant to the textual input, wherein the micro-context refers to assembling words of the textual input to form small, coherent groups to determine the meaning of the textual input by determining the content that would exist and be understood if inputs were spoken by the user under the circumstances' [fig 5-6, col 7, line 18-33, col 9, line 10-28], Gable specifically teaches various modules, for example community module, profile module, atlas module, target profile module, query builder module, filter module, retrieval modules and like as detailed in fig 5, further, Gable also teaches various electronic objects relevant to user based community containing various topics, community lexicon may be defined, created for each topic, subtopic, context relationship and like that corresponds to both micro and macro context assembling of various phrases, words from the textual lexicon as detailed in fig 6, 'micro-context further comprises determining at least one of characteristics of the user submitted the textual input and characteristics of prior searches conducted by the user submitted the textual input' [col 9, line 10-35, fig 6], 'the filtering module further programmed to locate information corresponding to the micro-context in a database' [col 9, line 36-47], 'a context construction module to combine words in the text to form the micro-context characteristic of the information' [col 9, line 61-65], 'a contact comparison module to determine a macro-context relevant to the micro-context, wherein the macro-context contains substantially the entire text of web pages provided by more than one separately independent entities' [col 11, line 21-42], 'an information matching module to

Art Unit: 2177

locate information corresponding to the macro-context in the database, the database being contextually indexed for searching by context' [col 11, line 43-67, col 12, line 1-2], 'a presentation module to receive the information and present the information to the user' [fig 5, col 8, line 3-8].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

30. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maynard, US Patent No. 6175830 as applied to claim1 above, and further in view of Franklin et al., [hereafter Franklin], US Patent No. 6125352

31. As to Claim 11, Maynard does not specifically teach 'information includes data about products purchasable by a user over the Internet', although Maynard specifically teaches information such as Web pages resident on the Internet and to display the results of the search based on the user-selected criteria [see col 3, line 33-36]. On the

Art Unit: 2177

other hand, Franklin teaches a system which including 'information includes data about products purchasable by a user over the Internet' [col 1, line 14-18, fig 1, fig 4].

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Franklin et al. into information management, retrieval and display system of Maynard because both are directed to information management, retrieval and display of the information to the user [see Maynard Abstract; Franklin, Abstract], more specifically, Maynard is directed to various modules that including indexing, search modules searching database having a database record for each of the finite elements identified, further each database record includes an address or location of the corresponding finite elements [see col 2, line 5-14], while Franklin specifically directed to conducting commerce over the distributed network manage merchant and product information in an electronic shopping though user interface allowing users to search and shop for products [see col 8, line 19-28]. One of the ordinary skills in the art at the time of applicant's invention would have been motivated to combine the references because that would have allowed users of Maynard's information management, retrieval and display system to control which relative product information or product data of individual products that are purchased on the internet satisfies his or her needs as suggested by Franklin et al [col 9, line 61-67, col 10, line 1-9].

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on 3/8/2004 with respect to Claims 1-224 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive, for examiner's response, see discussion below:

- a) At page 2, Examiner noted applicant's argument with respect to "Objection to the information disclosure Statement", further as noted in the above office action, and previous office action mailed on 9/5/2003, applicant is hereby required to submit publishing date for the documents submitted in PTO-1449 for further consideration.
- b) At page 3, Claims 1, 14, 17, applicant argues, "Maynard does not disclose a filtering module programmed to determine a micro-context relevant to the text...."

As to the above argument [b], examiner disagree with the applicant because firstly Maynard is directed to information management and retrieval system, more specifically specific search or query string(s) searches database for retrieving relevant document(s) from the information resources as detailed in Abstract, fig 1; secondly, Maynard teaches various modules in conjunction with search query, more specifically Maynard specifically teaches a) search module, b) index module) break module and d) un-break module as detailed in fig 1; thirdly, as noted from the Maynard's fig 1, search module fig 1, element 14 is integral part of Maynard's teaching that corresponds to filtering module as noted in the above office action.

Art Unit: 2177

As best understood by the examiner, Maynard teaches search engine capable of not only searches wide varieties of information or databases, but also matching information based on the input including optional filter that will filter out web sites that corresponds to filtering module, more specifically Maynard directed to search module utilizing search query to search through the database records element 80a-80z to find the database records element 86 matching the words or phrases in the search query as detailed in col 14, line 4-7, it is also noted that Maynard teaches specifically break module that break up the information into finite elements for example paragraphs, sections, sub-sections, segments and like [col 1, line 57-64] corresponds to matching the micro-context relevant to the text in other words text of query, therefore, Maynard teaches micro-context that is determined from the text of query.

c) At page 4, Claims 1,14,17, applicant argues Maynard provides no disclosure of determining the context of a query.

As to the argument [c], as explained above, Maynard does teach context of a query because search results are based on relevant text query that containing search words or phrases and/or operators tying the words together as detailed in col 6, line 43-46.

Art Unit: 2177

d) At page 4, Claims 1,14,17, applicant argues a query and the information being searched are two distinct things, while the office action errs in confusing the two claims 1,14,17 do not.

As to the above arguments [d], as best understood by the examiner, Maynard specifically teaches text of query because finite elements of Maynard are corresponds to individual paragraphs of document [col 6, line 9-11], further, examiner also noted that Maynard suggests finite elements are not a single word, phrase or symbol but part or portions of a document [col 6, line 6-8], therefore, Maynard's teaches both text or micro context and information search.

Examiner applies above arguments to dependent Claims 2-13,15-16,18-22.

e) At page 5, Claims 23-24, applicant argues, "Gable does not disclose a filtering module that determines the micro-content of textual input by assembling words of the textual input iinto small, coherent groups

As to the above argument [e], examiner disagree with the applicant because firstly, Gable is directed to search and retrieval information system, more specifically Gabile teaches various modules, such as search module, query build module, master search query, indexing module, profile module, pattern analysis module as detailed in fig 5. As noted above, Gable specifically teaches search module that corresponds to

Art Unit: 2177

filtering module as detailed in fig 5, element 52. Furthermore, Gable also teaches both keyword, or phrase and text query search, specifically, search query may have words or phrases for searching relevant document(s), and two topics search [col 4, line.40-44], further, Gabile also defines "topic" search, i.e., topic search may be a type of document, reports or status reports, document names, or indicative words within the documents or documents storage location, or address such as web-site address and like [see col 4, line 45-50, col 6, line 59-63]. As best understood by the examiner, Gable not only teaches filtering module with respect to query builder module, master search module, but also searches topic, sub-topic, context association, report types as detailed in col 4, line 40-44,col 6, line 59-63 that corresponds to micro-context of textual query.

f) In response to applicant's argument at page 6, Claim 11,that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

In this case, Maynard, Franklin both are directed to information management, retrieval and display of the information to the user [see Maynard Abstract; Franklin, Abstract], more specifically, Maynard is directed to various modules that including

Art Unit: 2177

indexing, search modules searching database having a database record for each of the finite elements identified, further each database record includes an address or location of the corresponding finite elements [see col 2, line 5-14], while Franklin specifically directed to conducting commerce over the distributed network manage merchant and product information in an electronic shopping though user interface allowing users to search and shop for products [see col 8, line 19-28]. One of the ordinary skills in the art at the time of applicant's invention would have been motivated to combine the references because that would have allowed users of Maynard's information management, retrieval and display system to control which relative product information or product data of individual products that are purchased on the internet satisfies his or her needs as suggested by Franklin et al [col 9, line 61-67, col 10, line 1-9].

Art Unit: 2177

Conclusion

The prior art made of record

- a. US Patent No. 6175830
- b. US Patent No. 6125352
- c. US Patent No. 6029165

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure

- d. US Patent No. 6021409
- e. US Patent No. 6289342
- f. US Patent No. 6438539
- g. US Patent No. 6314420
- h. US Patent No. 5724571
- i. US Patent No. 5873079
- j. US Patent No. 6260077
- k. US Patent No 6073167
- l. WO9623265
- m. US Patent No. 6134532
- n. US Patent No 5905988
- o. www.microset.com/search, TEXT SEARCH 1997-

2004, two pages.

Art Unit: 2177

p. Xiaoli Li et al., « using micro information units for internet search », proceedings of the eleventh international conference on information and knowledge management, 2002, pp 566-576

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2177

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Srirama Channavajjala whose telephone number is (703) 308-8538. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM Eastern Time. The TC2100's Customer Service number is (703) 306-5631.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene, can be reached on (703) 305-9790. The fax phone numbers for the organization where the application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

703/746-7238	(After Final Communication)
703/872-9306	(Offical Communications)
703/746-7240	(For Status inquiries, draft communication)

Any inquiry of general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

SC *[Signature]*
Patent Examiner.
April 5, 2004.